

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy
PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**




b2

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: DEC 03 2010

IN RE: Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Beneficiary: [REDACTED]

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The service center director denied the nonimmigrant visa petition, and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed. The petition will be denied.

On the Form I-129 visa petition the petitioner stated that it is an IT (information technology) consulting, staffing, and software development firm. To employ the beneficiary in what it designates as a programmer analyst position, the petitioner endeavors to classify her as a nonimmigrant worker in a specialty occupation pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b).

The director denied the petition, finding (1) that the petitioner failed to demonstrate that it is a U.S. employer within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) or an agent within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F), (2) that the petitioner had not demonstrated that the beneficiary would be employed in a specialty occupation, and (3) that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary is qualified for the proffered position. On appeal, counsel asserted that the director's bases for denial are erroneous, and contended that the petitioner satisfied all evidentiary requirements. In support of these contentions, counsel submitted a brief and additional evidence.

The AAO bases its decision upon its review of the entire record of proceedings, which includes: (1) the petitioner's Form I-129 and the supporting documentation filed with it; (2) the service center's request for additional evidence (RFE); (3) the response to the RFE; (4) the director's denial letter; and (5) the Form I-290B and counsel's brief and attached exhibits in support of the appeal.

The AAO will first address the director's finding that the petitioner has not demonstrated that it is the beneficiary's prospective employer, within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), or an agent, within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F).

Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b), defines an H-1B nonimmigrant as an alien:

(i) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services . . . in a specialty occupation described in section 1184(i)(1) . . . , who meets the requirements of the occupation specified in section 1184(i)(2) . . . , and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines . . . that the intending employer has filed with the Secretary an application under 1182(n)(1).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(i) states:

(h) Temporary employees--(1) Admission of temporary employees--(i) General. Under section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Act, an alien may be authorized to come to the United States temporarily to perform services or labor for, or to receive training from, an employer, if petitioned for by that employer. . . .

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(A) identifies a “United States employer” as authorized to file an H-1B petition. “United States employer” is defined at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii) as follows:

United States employer means a person, firm, corporation, contractor, or other association, or organization in the United States which:

- (1) Engages a person to work within the United States;
- (2) Has an employer-employee relationship with respect to employees under this part, as indicated by the fact that it may hire, pay, fire, supervise, or otherwise control the work of any such employee; and
- (3) Has an Internal Revenue Service Tax identification number.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(2)(i)(F) allows a “United States agent” to file a petition “in cases involving workers who are traditionally self-employed or workers who use agents to arrange short-term employment on their behalf with numerous employers, and in cases where a foreign employer authorizes the agent to act on its behalf.”

The record contains no indication that the petitioner is an agent or that it claims to be. The remaining determination pertinent to the petitioner’s standing to file the visa petition is whether the petitioner qualifies as a U.S. employer.

Upon review, there is sufficient evidence in the record to establish that the petitioner would more likely than not be the beneficiary’s employer. Further, the director did not clearly state the basis for her finding that the evidence fails to demonstrate that the petitioner will be the beneficiary’s employer, and the AAO is unable to find any contrary indication. This basis for denying the visa petition is withdrawn.

Another basis for denial is the director’s finding that the petitioner has not demonstrated that the beneficiary would work in a specialty occupation.

Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), defines the term “specialty occupation” as an occupation that requires:

- (A) theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge, and
- (B) attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in the specific specialty (or its equivalent) as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii):

Specialty occupation means an occupation which requires theoretical and practical application of a body of highly specialized knowledge in fields of human endeavor including, but not limited to, architecture, engineering, mathematics, physical sciences, social sciences, medicine and health, education, business specialties, accounting, law, theology, and the arts, and which requires the attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher in a specific specialty, or its equivalent, as a minimum for entry into the occupation in the United States.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A), to qualify as a specialty occupation, the position must also meet one of the following criteria:

1. A baccalaureate or higher degree or its equivalent is normally the minimum requirement for entry into the particular position;
2. The degree requirement is common to the industry in parallel positions among similar organizations or, in the alternative, an employer may show that its particular position is so complex or unique that it can be performed only by an individual with a degree;
3. The employer normally requires a degree or its equivalent for the position; or
4. The nature of the specific duties are so specialized and complex that knowledge required to perform the duties is usually associated with the attainment of a baccalaureate or higher degree.

As a threshold issue, it is noted that 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must logically be read together with section 214(i)(1) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1184(i)(1), and 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii). In other words, this regulatory language must be construed in harmony with the thrust of the related provisions and with the statute as a whole. *See K Mart Corp. v. Cartier Inc.*, 486 U.S. 281, 291 (1988) (holding that construction of language which takes into account the design of the statute as a whole is preferred); *see also COIT Independence Joint Venture v. Federal Sav. and Loan Ins. Corp.*, 489 U.S. 561 (1989); *Matter of W-F-*, 21 I&N Dec. 503 (BIA 1996). As such, the criteria stated in 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) should logically be read as being necessary but not necessarily sufficient to meet the statutory and regulatory definition of specialty occupation. To otherwise interpret this section as stating the necessary *and* sufficient conditions for meeting the definition of specialty occupation would result in particular positions meeting a condition under 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) but not the statutory or regulatory definition. *See Defensor v. Meissner*, 201 F.3d at 387. To avoid this illogical and absurd result, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) must therefore be read as stating additional requirements that a position must meet, supplementing the statutory and regulatory definitions of specialty occupation.

Consonant with section 214(i)(1) of the Act and the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii), USCIS consistently interprets the term “degree” in the criteria at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to mean not just any baccalaureate or higher degree, but one in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proffered position. Applying this standard, USCIS regularly approves H-1B petitions for qualified

aliens who are to be employed as engineers, computer scientists, certified public accountants, college professors, and other such professions. These occupations all require a baccalaureate degree in the specific specialty as a minimum for entry into the occupation and fairly represent the types of professions that Congress contemplated when it created the H-1B visa category.

In a letter dated March 31, 2009, the petitioner's vice president stated that the proffered position is a programmer analyst position provided the following description of its duties:

1. Analyses Business requirements/user problems to determine feasibility of application or design within time and cost restraints. Formulate and define scope and objectives through fact-finding to develop or modify complex software programming applications or information systems (approximately 15% of daily work time)
2. System study, design, development, testing, and implementing of IT solutions in application Testing software using WinRunner, Windows (approximately 20% of daily work time)
3. Formulates and designs software system using scientific analysis and mathematical models to predict and measure outcome and consequences of design. Includes preparation of functional specifications and designing of software programs. Builds detailed design specs and programs for scientific, engineering, and business application. Design data conversion software programs (approximately 15% daily work time)
4. Develops and directs software systems testing procedures, programming and documentation. Also, include testing unites and computer software systems. Provide End User Training and Knowledge transfer (approximately 20% of daily work time)
5. Perform coding, testing and performance tuning of application (approximately 30# of daily work time)

The petitioner's vice president asserted that performance of those duties requires a minimum of a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in computer science, engineering, information systems.

The AAO recognizes the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) *Occupational Outlook Handbook* (*Handbook*) as an authoritative source on the duties and educational requirements of the wide variety of occupations that it addresses.¹ The AAO discusses programmer analyst positions in the section entitled Computer Systems Analysts. As to the duties of programmer analysts, the *Handbook* states:

To begin an assignment, systems analysts consult with an organization's managers and users to define the goals of the system and then design a system to meet those goals. They specify the inputs that the system will access, decide how the inputs will

¹ The *Handbook*, which is available in printed form, may also be accessed on the Internet, at <http://www.stats.bls.gov/oco/>. The AAO's references to the *Handbook* are to the 2010 – 2011 edition available online, accessed November 1, 2010.

be processed, and format the output to meet users' needs. Analysts use techniques such as structured analysis, data modeling, information engineering, mathematical model building, sampling, and a variety of accounting principles to ensure their plans are efficient and complete. They also may prepare cost-benefit and return-on-investment analyses to help management decide whether implementing the proposed technology would be financially feasible.

When a system is approved, systems analysts oversee the implementation of the required hardware and software components. They coordinate tests and observe the initial use of the system to ensure that it performs as planned. They prepare specifications, flow charts, and process diagrams for computer programmers to follow; then they work with programmers to "debug," or eliminate errors, from the system. Systems analysts who do more in-depth testing may be called *software quality assurance analysts*. In addition to running tests, these workers diagnose problems, recommend solutions, and determine whether program requirements have been met. After the system has been implemented, tested, and debugged, computer systems analysts may train its users and write instruction manuals.

Specifically as to programmer analyst positions, the *Handbook* states:

In some organizations, *programmer-analysts* design and update the software that runs a computer. They also create custom applications tailored to their organization's tasks. Because they are responsible for both programming and systems analysis, these workers must be proficient in both areas.

The AAO finds that the description of the duties of the proffered position do, in fact, show that it is a programmer analyst position.

As to the education required for entry into computer systems analyst positions, including programmer analyst positions, the *Handbook* states:

When hiring computer systems analysts, employers usually prefer applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree. For more technically complex jobs, people with graduate degrees are preferred. For jobs in a technical or scientific environment, employers often seek applicants who have at least a bachelor's degree in a technical field, such as computer science, information science, applied mathematics, engineering, or the physical sciences. For jobs in a business environment, employers often seek applicants with at least a bachelor's degree in a business-related field such as management information systems (MIS). Increasingly, employers are seeking individuals who have a master's degree in business administration (MBA) with a concentration in information systems.

Despite the preference for technical degrees, however, people who have degrees in other areas may find employment as systems analysts if they also have technical

skills. Courses in computer science or related subjects combined with practical experience can qualify people for some jobs in the occupation.

Employers generally look for people with expertise relevant to the job. For example, systems analysts who wish to work for a bank may need some expertise in finance, and systems analysts who wish to work for a hospital may need some knowledge of health management. Furthermore, business enterprises generally prefer individuals with information technology, business, and accounting skills and frequently assist employees in obtaining these skills.

That “employers usually prefer applicants [with] at least a bachelor’s degree” for systems analyst positions does not suggest that a bachelor’s degree is the minimum education required for computer systems analyst positions, including programmer analyst positions. Further, for those positions that do require a bachelor’s degree, a degree in computer science, information science, applied mathematics, engineering, or the physical sciences suffices for some jobs; a bachelor’s degree in a business-related field such as management information systems is preferred for others; and “people who have degrees in other areas may find employment as systems analysts if they also have technical skills.”

The *Handbook* does not support the proposition that computer systems analyst positions in general, or programmer analyst positions more specifically, require a minimum of a bachelor’s degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty. In addition, the petitioner’s vice president stated that the proffered position requires a bachelor’s degree in computer science, engineering, or information systems. The AAO notes that “computer science, engineering, [and] information systems” do not appear to comprise a specific specialty. As such, to assert that the duties can be performed by a person with a degree in any one of those disciplines implies that the proffered position is not, in fact, a position in a specialty occupation.²

² The field of engineering, for example, is a very broad category that covers numerous and various disciplines, some of which may only be linked through the basic principles of science and mathematics. A petitioner must demonstrate that the proffered position requires a precise and specific course of study that relates directly and closely to the position in question. Since there must be a close correlation between the required specialized studies and the position, the requirement of a degree with a generalized title, such as business administration, without further specification, does not establish the position as a specialty occupation. See *Matter of Michael Hertz Associates*, 19 I&N Dec. 558 (Comm. 1988). To prove that a job requires the theoretical and practical application of a body of specialized knowledge as required by Section 214(i)(1) of the Act, a petitioner must establish that the position requires the attainment of a bachelor’s or higher degree in a specialized field of study. As explained above, USCIS interprets the degree requirement at 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) to require a degree in a specific specialty that is directly related to the proposed position. USCIS has consistently stated that, although a general-purpose bachelor’s degree, such as a degree in business administration, may be a legitimate prerequisite for a particular position, requiring such a degree, without more, will not justify a finding that a particular position qualifies

Further, the description of the duties of the proffered position provided by the petitioner's vice president is so generalized and abstract that the AAO cannot determine from an analysis of those duties that their performance would necessarily require a degree in any specific specialty.

Neither the *Handbook* nor any other evidence in the record supports the proposition that programmer analyst positions in general require a minimum of a bachelor's degree or the equivalent in a specific specialty. The petitioner has not, therefore, demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation pursuant to the criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(1).


The petitioner provided no evidence pertinent to the educational requirements of comparable programmer analyst positions with companies similar to the petitioner and has not, therefore, demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation pursuant to the criterion of the first clause of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

The record contains no evidence that the petitioner has ever previously hired anyone to fill the proffered position, and the petitioner has not, therefore demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a position in a specialty occupation pursuant to the criterion of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(3).

The petitioner has not demonstrated that the proffered position or the duties peculiar to it are so complex, unique, or specialized that they can only be performed by a person with a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or the equivalent or that performance of the duties is usually associated with a minimum of a bachelor's degree in a specific specialty or the equivalent. The petitioner has not, therefore, demonstrated that the proffered position qualifies as a specialty occupation pursuant to the criteria of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(4) or the criteria of the second clause of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A)(2).

Because the petitioner has satisfied none of the criteria of 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(iii)(A) the proffered position has not been demonstrated to be a specialty occupation position pursuant to the meaning of sections 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) and 214(i)(1) of the Act and the petition cannot be approved. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied on this basis.

The director also determined that the beneficiary would not be qualified to work in the proffered position even if it had been found to be a specialty occupation. However, a beneficiary's credentials to perform a particular job are relevant only when the job is found to be a specialty occupation. As discussed in this decision, the proffered position does not require a baccalaureate or higher degree, or its equivalent, in a specific specialty. Therefore, the AAO will not address the beneficiary's qualifications further.


Page 9

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met. The appeal will be dismissed and the petition denied.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed. The petition is denied.